

Reply to Office Action of June 27 2005
Amendment Dated: December 20, 2005

Appl. No.: 09/785,884
Attorney Docket No.: CSCO-002/94701

REMARKS

Claims 1-66 were examined in the Final Office Action mailed 06/27/2005 ("Outstanding Office Action"). All the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ketcham (U.S. Patent Number 6,721,334) in view of Pereira (U.S. Patent Number 5,781,726). Claims 1, 10, 15, 37 and 42 are sought to be amended, claims 51-58 and 61-66 are sought to be canceled, and new claims 67-78 are sought to be added by virtue of this amendment. The cancellations, additions and amendments are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Claims 1-50, 59-60 and 67-78 are thus respectfully presented for consideration.

Telephone Interview

Applicants again thank Examiner Lesniewski for the telephone interview of November 30 2005. Only Examiner Lesniewski and the undersigned representative were present in the interview. The subject matter of new claim 67, incorporated into previously presented independent claim 1, was discussed. Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended to recite a new feature, not discussed in the interview.

It is believed that the Applicant has met the burden of providing substance of the interview, further in view of the interview summary mailed by the Examiner on December 5 2005. See MPEP § 713.04 and 37 CFR § 1.133.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 14-16, 21-23, 25, 29, 30, 35-40, 42, and 46-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ketcham (U.S. Patent Number 6,721,334) in view of Pereira (U.S. Patent Number 5,781,726). Claims 5-7, 11, 13, 17-19, 24, 26, 28, 31, 32, 34, 41, 43, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ketcham in view of Pereira, further in view of Chao et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,964,837). Claims 12, 20, 27, 33, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ketcham in view of Pereira, further in view of Chao et al., further in view of Simpson ("RFC 1661: Point-to-Point Protocol," July 1994).